



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,238	06/27/2003	Jean D. Paoli	MSI-1407US	7738
69316	7590	10/30/2007		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052			EXAMINER NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/609,238

Applicant(s)

PAOLI ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-62 and 66-83 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 63-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 15-62 and 66-83 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions Groups II-VII, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 7/30/07.

Applicant's election with traverse of Inventions Group I in the reply filed on 7/30/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that applicant feels that there would not be an undue burden in examining Groups II-VII in a single application since the six groups of claims are not so different. This is not found persuasive because these inventions are distinct and have acquired separate status in the art as evident by their different classification and divergent subject matter.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference sign 1116 in lines 5-6 of section [0102]. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New

Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 208 of fig. 2; 414 of fig. 4; 606 of fig. 6b; 704 of fig. 7b; 1000 of fig. 10; 1140 and 1142 of fig. 11; 1212 and 1216 of fig. 12a; and, 1216 and 1222 of fig. 12b.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), *or amendment to the specification* to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2174

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-14 and 63-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Although paragraph [0037] of the published specification describes a travel itinerary form solution generated after data was input by a user, it is unclear what is meant by discovering/deploying a solution "without user interaction" in claims 1 and 63. Therefore, the examiner will interpret discovering/deploying "without user interaction" a solution to mean: discovering/deploying a solution. In regards to claim 7, it is unclear what is meant by "primarily data" since the limits of what constitutes as "primarily" is not described.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14 and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Larcheveque et al. ("Larcheveque").

As per claims 1 and 14, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method

comprising: receiving input to open a data file having a solution (fig. 2); discovering/deploying, without user interaction, the solution, i.e. discovering/deploying a solution (par. [0092]); displaying, by opening the data file with the solution, an electronic form having operable fields (figs. 2, 4-8, 17-25); and enabling a user to enter data into the operable fields of the electronic form, wherein the solution defines the availability of one or more actions to the user when entering the data into each said operable field of the electronic form (par. [0092]).

As per claim 2, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising receiving data entered into the operable fields of the electronic form and altering the data in the data file so as to correspondingly reflect the data received (par. [0042]).

As per claim 3, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the availability of one or more actions to the user concurs with an event elected from the group consisting of: an association of an input device being used by the user with one said operable field (par. [0048] and [0052]); a cursor position corresponding to an input device being used by the user is proximal to one said operable field (par. [0052]); one said operable field is selected by the user by use of an input device (par. [0048], mouse 114); one said operable field on the electronic form is made to be an active field by operation of an input device being used by the user (par. [0052]); specific conditions are met wherein specific conditions are met with respect to the data in the one said operable field (par. [0092]; otherwise an error may be generated); when the user's

Art Unit: 2174

mouse pointer for an input device rests over, within, or proximal to an editable region of one said operable field (par. [0052]); when the user's mouse pointer for an input device rests over, within, or proximal to an editable region of one said operable field and the mouse is clicked one or more times (par. [0052]).

As per claim 5, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the availability of each said action is determined on the basis of the context of each said operable field of the electronic form with respect to at least one other said operable field of the electronic form (par. [0092]).

As per claim 7, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the data file includes primarily data (par. [0042]).

As per claim 8, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the data file is written in XML (Abstract).

As per claim 9, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein: the solution includes a presentation application that includes the electronic form and the presentation file contains logic to gives the display of the electronic form a graphical, visual representation of the operable fields (figs. 2, 4-8, 17-25).

As per claim 11, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the

solution includes a logic application for ensuring the validity of the received data that is entered into the operable fields of the electronic form (par. [0097]).

As per claim 12, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the logic application includes an XML schema (Abstract; implemented in XML and generates XML schema).

Claim 63 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 64 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4, 6, 10 and 13 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larcheveque et al. ("Larcheveque").

As per claim 4, Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein each said action is selected from the group consisting of: a request for *one or more of a* display of a menu and an activation of a menu item of a menu (par. [0092] and [0202]);

Art Unit: 2174

an editing operation with respect to data in *at least one* said operable field that is one or more of an undo function, a redo function, a copy function, a cut function, a paste function, an insertion of a hyperlink, and a carriage return or line feed function; performing a character formatting operation with respect to data in at least one said operable field that is one or more of a boldface, an italics, an underlining, a change of font size or font color, character spacing, and text effects (par. [0052]); and adding, entering, updating or deleting, with respect to at least one said operable field, one or more of a repeating operable field, an optional operable field, a spreadsheet, a table, a row or a column in a table, a text box, multiple spaces, a header, a footer, an image, a graphic, a picture, a link to an image, a link to a graphic, a link to a picture, single line plain text, multi-line plain text, single line formatted text, multi-line formatted text, rich text, a whole number, a decimal, a true/false distinction, a date, and a time (par. [0052]).

Larcheveque does not explicitly disclose the menu being a tool bar wherein users can activate a command tool. Official Notice is taken that menus in a tool bar format wherein users can activate a command tool are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate a tool bar format wherein users can activate a command tool to the method of Larcheveque in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

As per claim 6, although Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising discovering the solution (par. [0092]), Larcheveque does not

Art Unit: 2174

explicitly disclose discovering a solution identifier in the data file, computing a special name from the solution identifier, and discovering the solution using the special name. Official Notice is taken that having an identifier and looking up the name from a look up table such as in the case wherein a hash map computes a name from the identifier is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate a data file containing an identifier wherein from the identifier, a name of a solution is computed to the method of Larcheveque given that saving as an identifier or hash rather than the actual name is more compact and, therefore, saves space.

As per claim 10, although Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising a presentation application (figs. 2, 4-8, 17-25; par. [0092]), Larcheveque does not explicitly disclose the presentation application being written in XSLT. Official Notice is taken that presentation applications being written in XSLT is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of having presentation applications written in XSLT with the method of Larcheveque given in order to provide a nice format and transform, for example, XML to other formats given that some devices support only certain formats.

As per claim 13, although Larcheveque teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising an electronic form (2, 4-8, 17-25), Larcheveque does not explicitly disclose it being written in XHTML. Official Notice is taken that using XHTML is well known in the

Art Unit: 2174

art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate XHTML to the method of Larcheveque in order to display such things as forms in browsers wherein displaying in browsers are additionally beneficial in that it does not require additional installation of software on desktops which would require additional support costs and that it is flexible, allowing users to access such things as forms from anywhere.

Claim 65 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bloomquist et al. (US 7089503) teach loan customization system and process.

Hitchcock et al. (US 6345278) teach forms engine.

Tupper et al. (US 20040073475) teach parametric modeling system and method.

Inquires


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at (571) 272-4063.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lvn
Patent Examiner
October 12, 2007


SY D. LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :2007-10-08, 2007-07-30, 2007-06-14, 2006-12-20, 2006-10-23, 2006-07-31, 2006-05-25, 2006-02-02 and 2005-12-05.